



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

satisfying. In the third place, Foth's suggestion that the meaning of the verb influences its tense-force is too good to be dropped. It rests upon and explains too many facts, e. g. the use of *habui* and *fui* 'I had (was), but have (am) not now,' the use of the same perf. form for inchoatives and for simple verbs, the Plautine *adstiti* = *adsto*, and others. It would explain also the very important fact, which Blase's theory does not explain, that, however the shifting may have begun, it spreads along the line of verb-meaning, from *aequom fuerat* to *debuerat* and *oportuerat*.

To point out flaws in so good a piece of work as this is an ungrateful task, but what I have said touches at most only a small part of the book.

E. P. MORRIS.

Was ist Syntax? Ein kritischer Versuch von JOHN RIES. Marburg, 1894. Pp. 163.

The author is a Germanic philologist and his illustrations are drawn largely from this field, but his arguments and conclusions have a general application and deserve the notice of classical philologists. The outline of the argument is this:—

The meaning of syntax and its relation to other parts of grammar call for new definition. Three systems have hitherto been followed. First, the mixed system, in which the arrangement is partly logical, partly formal; second, the system of Miklosich, which avoids the confusion of the mixed system by confining syntax to the doctrine of the meaning of words and classes of words, omitting all study of the clause; third, the system which makes syntax the science of the sentence. The mixed system is condemned by its nature, and the system of Miklosich by its exclusion of the most important part of syntax. The third doctrine, that *Syntax ist Satzlehre*, is now somewhat widely held, but is also open to serious objections. The sentence is a logical rather than a linguistic unit, the definitions of a sentence vary greatly, and phrases and clauses can be treated only as parts of a sentence. Difficulties therefore arise in the application of the doctrine. Schmalz, in Müller's Handbuch, vol. II, under the heading Simple Sentences, treats cases, modes, tenses, i. e. falls into mixed syntax, and, still worse, he treats these under declarative sentences, as if they did not belong equally to interrogative sentences.

The way out of all this confusion is to substitute the series *sound—word—combination of words* for the series *sound—word—sentence*, as descriptive of the three kinds of objects treated in grammar, and to recognize the fundamental distinction between *form* and *meaning*. This gives (omitting sounds, which have no corresponding meaning and can be treated only from the formal point of view) a cross-division, according as we classify by the object treated or by the method, thus:

	<i>Words.</i>	<i>Word-combinations.</i>
<i>Form.</i>	Inflection.	Syntactical Forms.
<i>Meaning.</i>	Semasiology.	Syntactical Functions.

The chief difficulty of the system lies in the fact that it is impossible to draw a perfectly clear line between the meaning of inflectional forms and their use in sentences. In fact, inflection does not exist in isolation, but only when the word enters into combination with other words. The difficulty, however, is one of logic rather than of practice, for in all grammars the distinction is actually made, though not always clearly, the form and a simple definition of the genitive, for example, being given under the head of inflections, while the uses are reserved for syntax. Grimm and Diez divide the treatment of gender in the same way. If some slight repetition or overlapping results, it is not harmful, but is like the repetitions which necessarily occur in any science which treats the same material from different standpoints.

Ries's system is not a mere war about words. It will not, indeed, solve all the problems of order and arrangement which trouble the writer of a Latin grammar, but it will enable an investigator in any field of grammar except phonetics to approach his task with a clearer conception of its limitations and of its relation to other problems, and that is a great gain. American scholars especially should note two points. First, in any fair division of the field of grammar the new science of Semasiology claims a larger share of attention than it is now receiving, and, being to a considerable extent virgin soil, it holds out the hope of large rewards to those who first enter upon it. Second, Ries lays great, but not too great, stress upon the need of distinguishing between form and function in syntactical work. He says that every competent investigator begins with the form and works toward the function. I should prefer to say that, while functional classification may at times be a useful temporary expedient, the investigator who cannot ultimately define the forms which correspond to his functional classifications is a blind guide. Browning might 'neglect the form,' but the student of syntax who does it is lost.

E. P. MORRIS.

---

Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Religionen, von Dr. PAUL DEUSSEN. Erster Band, erste Abtheilung: Allgemeine Einleitung und Philosophie des Veda bis auf die Upanishad's.

Dr. Paul Deussen has already won a name as an interpreter of Hindu philosophy, his *System des Vedānta* and *Sūtra* (of the same school) having showed him to be a patient and careful student. The present work, of which the first part of the first volume is at hand, takes a much wider sweep, as is sufficiently indicated by the title. Deussen purposes to give the history of the philosophy of the Hindus in the first volume of this work (with an excursus in five chapters on the philosophy of the Chinese); that of the Greeks in the first part of the second volume (with a chapter on Roman philosophy); that of the Egyptians, Semites, Iranians, Christians, and scholastics of the middle ages in the second part of the same volume (with an excursus on Byzantine, Arabian and Judaic culture); and a complete account of modern philosophy in the third part of the same second volume. A mighty undertaking, the daring of which must awaken universal admiration, the more so if, as is done in the first part, not only philosophy but religion, and not only religion but mythology